1	LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN J. ROSENBERG, P.C. Steven J. Rosenberg (Bar No. 123624)			
2	sjrlaw@aol.com 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 224			
3	Chicago, Illinois 60604-3607 Telephone: (312) 362-0400			
4	Facsimile: (312) 431-8694			
5	Attorneys for Specially Appearing Defendant ROBERT A. PUTNAM			
6	RODERT II. I O II. II.			
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION			
11		*E-FILED - 1/11/06*		
12	McKESSON CORPORATION and HBO & COMPANY, INC.,	CASE NO.: C-05-04020 RMW (PVT)		
13	Plaintiffs,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]		
14	·	ORDER (1) SETTING BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND HEARING FOR		
15	vs. ARTHUR ANDERSEN LLP and	MOTION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL; (2)		
16	ROBERT A. PUTNAM, and DOES 1-20,	ENLARGING DEFENDANTS' TIME TO RESPOND TO THE COMPLAINT; AND		
17	Defendants.	(3) ADJUSTING CERTAIN DEADLINES FOR RULE 26 CONFERENCE, JOINT		
18		CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT, AND CASE MANAGEMENT		
19		CONFERENCE		
20		The Honorable Ronald Whyte		
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

11.			
1	WHEREAS, on August 11, 2005, Plaintiffs McKesson Corporation and		
2	HBO & Company, Inc. ("Plaintiffs") filed a Complaint against defendants Arthur		
3	Andersen LLP and Robert A. Putnam;		
4	Scheduling Regarding Motion For Interlocutory Review		
5	WHEREAS, on October 11, 2005, Specially Appearing Defendant Putnam		
6	filed a motion to dismiss the fifth and sixth causes of action for lack of personal		
7	jurisdiction;		
8	WHEREAS, by order dated November 30, 2005, this Court denied		
9	Putnam's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction (the Jurisdiction Order);		
10	WHEREAS, on December 14, 2005, Putnam intends to file a motion for		
11	certification of the Jurisdiction Order for interlocutory appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §		
12	1292(b);		
13	WHEREAS, by virtue of the holiday season, a modified briefing schedule is		
14	necessary;		
15	Responses To The Complaint		
16	WHEREAS, Putnam's current deadline for responding to the Complaint		
17	currently is December 14, 2005 and Andersen's current deadline for responding to the		
18	Complaint currently is December 23, 2005;		
19	WHEREAS, the parties believe that it would be most efficient for the Court		
20	to consider, and the parties to brief, motions to dismiss the Complaint on a uniform		
21	schedule after the Court's ruling on Putnam's motion for certification of the Jurisdiction		
22	Order for interlocutory review;		
23	Scheduling Regarding Rule 26 Conference And Related Deadlines		
24	WHEREAS, Andersen intends to file a cross-complaint against McKesson,		
25	HBOC, and others;		
26	WHEREAS, the current Rule 26 deadlines expire before defendants respond		
27	to the Complaint and before Andersen has had an opportunity to file its Cross Complaint;		
28	WHEREAS, the parties believe that it would be more efficient to continue		
	⊪ ~		

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Putnam's Motion For Interlocutory Review. Plaintiffs' opposition shall be filed and served on or before January 27, 2006. The hearing for Putnam's motion Responses To The Complaint. Absent further order of the Court, fourteen (14) days after the Court issues its ruling on Putnam's motion for certification of the Jurisdiction Order for interlocutory review. This stipulation and the order thereon are such as a stay of their obligation to respond to the Complaint or other similar relief, and is Rule 26 Deadlines. The current Rule 26 deadlines are vacated. The parties shall complete their Rule 26 disclosures and file their Rule 26 report on or before LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN J. ROSENBERG, P.C. Attorneys for Specially Appearing Defendant

Case 5:05-cv-04020-RMW Document 32 Filed 01/11/06 Page 4 of 5

1 2	DATED: December, 2005	ALSCHULER GROSSMAN STEIN & KAHAN LLP
3		
4		By Scott Vick
5		Attorneys for Defendant ARTHUR ANDERSEN LLP
6		
7	_	
8	DATED: December 12, 2005	SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
9		
10		Dis Alleria Control
11		Timothy Miller Attorneys for Plaintiffs McKESSON CORPORATION and HBO &
12		McKESSON CORPORATION and HBO &
13		COMPANY, INC.
14		<u>ORDER</u>
15	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
16		
17	DATED: December 28, 2005	
18		/s/ Ronald M. Whyte The Honorable Ronald M. Whyte
19		United States District Judge
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		•
28		-4-

Case 5:05-cv-04020-RMW Document 32 Filed 01/11/06 Page 5 of 5

1	DATED: December 12 2005	ALSCHULER GROSSMAN STEIN & KAHAN LLP
2		
3		By Jest Ville
4		Scott Vick
5		Attorneys for Defendant ARTHUR ANDERSEN LLP
6		
7	DATED: December, 2005	SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
9		And And A
10		
11		By
12		Timothy Miller Attorneys for Plaintiffs McKESSON CORPORATION and HBO &
13		COMPANY, INC.
14		<u>ORDER</u>
15	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
16	101001111	,
17	DATED: December, 2005	
18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The Honorable Ronald M. Whyte United States District Judge
19		United States District Judge
20	#	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		-4-